## FILED

Michael Romero K29169 P.B.S.P. D4-106 P.O. Box 7500 Crescent City, CA 95532

DEC 0 9 2013

RICHARD W. WIEKING CLERK, U.S. DISTRICT COURT, NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

10

11

12

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

16

17

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

MICHAEL ROMERO,

Plaintiff,

13

S. EllERY , et al. ,

Defendants.

Case No. C12-1084 WHO (PR)

PLAINTIFFS MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE ADDITIONAL INTERROGATORIES

Plaintiff filed the original complaint in the present action on December 16, 2011 in the Superior Court of Del Norte County. On July 3, 2012, the court dismissed the complaint with leave to amend. On August 24, 2012, plaintiff filed his First Amended Complaint (FAC). On January 17, 2013, the court screened the complaint and found six cognizable claims against staff at Pelican Bay State Prison as well as the former Secretary of CDCR, Matthew Cate. At this time the court also ordered discovery to commence. On April 2, 2013, plaintiff filed his first set of Interrogatories on all the named defendants. On July 5, 2013, the defendants filed their responses to plaintiffs first set of Interrogatories. On September 25, 2013, the defendants filed a motion to dismiss based on claims that:

-1

the course of his or her duties does not give them free reign to use any level of force they want to. Plaintiff's excessive use of

2

4

6

9

12

14

16

17 18

19

21

23

26

27

(1) plaintiff's complaint is barred under Heck v. Humphrey's, 512 U.S 477, (1994); (2) plaintiff failed to exhaust his administrative remedies; (3) plaintiff failed to state a claim; and, (4) the defendants are entitled to qualified immunity.

On October 23, 2013, plaintiff filed an opposition to the defendant's motion to dismiss. In the opposition plaintiff voluntarily terminated the claims for: failure to train, failure to investigate, failure to supervise, due process violations, and deliberate indifference to medical needs. Plaintiff also released defendants Cate, Lewis, Tupy. Ohland, Woods, Sayre, and Creed from any liability in the present complaint. As such , plaintiff's Eighth Amendment claim against defendants Ellery, Harman, and Grenert for excessive use of force is not barred under Heck v. Humphrey's . A finding of guilt for willfully disobeying a peace officer does not invalidate a claim for excessive use of force as disobeying or delaying a peace officer in the course of his or her duties does not give them free reign to use any level of force they want to. Plaintiff's excessive use of force claim was properly exhausted. Based on plaintiff's version of the events along with the evidence on record thus far, does state a claim for excessive use of force. And finally, there is no question that defendant's Ellery, Harman, and Grenert were on notice of their constitutional obligations regarding use of force after more than a decade of supervision at Pelican Bay by the Federal court following Madrid v. Gomez, 889 F. Supp. 1146 (1995).

Should the court deny the defendant's motion to dismiss, discovery will continue. Plaintiff is pro se with no formal legal training or experience. At each stage of the proceeding, plaintiff has attempted to clarify his claim and better follow the requirements and rules of

## Case3:12-cv-01084-WHO Document50 Filed12/09/13 Page3 of 6

the court. On April 2, 2013, plaintiff incorrectly filed a uniform set of Interrogatories on all ten defendants that was overly broad and exceeded the number of Interrogatories permitted under Rule 33 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

Through his opposition to Defendant's Motion to Dismiss, plaintiff has worked to better organize and clarify the claim against the three remaining defendants. Under Local Rule 33-3 as well as Rules 26(6)(2) and 33 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, plaintiff now respectfully requests the court's leave to file a new set of Interrogatories on defendants Filery, Harman, and Grenert not to exceed the (25) twenty five Interrogatory limit prescribed in Rule 33 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. With an increased understanding of legal standards and requirements, plaintiff argues that leave to file a new set of Interrogatories on each of the 3 defendants will allow plaintiff to better develop the relevant facts on the record prior to the summary judgement stage.

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and accurate.

Date: November 21, 2013

Respectfully Submitted, M. Ramero Plaintiff, Pro Se

## PROOF OF SERVICE BY MAIL BY PERSON IN STATE CUSTODY

(Fed. R. Civ. P.5; 28 U.S.C. § 1746)

I, Michael Romero , declare:	
I am over 18 years of age and a party to this action. I am a resident of:	
Pelican Bay State Prison, in the County of	
Del Norte State of California.	
My prison address is:	
P.O. Box 7500	
Crescent City, CA 95532	
On 21 day of November , 20 13	
I served the attached document	
Motion for Leave to File	
Additional Interrogatories	
on the parties herein by placing true and correct copies thereof, enclosed in a sealed envelope,	
with postage thereon fully paid, in the United States Mail in a deposit box so provided at the	
above-named correctional institution in which I am presently confined. This envelope was	
addressed as follows:  O TO  U.S. District Court	
Robert Dugician Northern District of Califor	n
455 Golden Gate Ave. suite 11000 1150 Golden Gate Ave. San Francisco, CA 94102-7004 San Francisco, CA 94102	
I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States of America that the	
forgoing is true and correct.	
EXECUTED ON: 21 day of November , 20 13	
m Romors	
Signature of Declarant	

Case3:12-cv-01084-WHO Document50 Filed12/09/13 Page6 of 6

PELICAN BAY STATE PRISON
SECURITY HOUSING UNIT
UNIT D-4

CONFIDENTIAL WAIL

11/2/3